



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/714,503	11/12/2003	Bo Pi	12227-066001	1055
20985	7590	06/13/2005	EXAMINER	
FISH & RICHARDSON, PC 12390 EL CAMINO REAL SAN DIEGO, CA 92130-2081			KIANNI, KAVEH C	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2883	

DATE MAILED: 06/13/2005

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/714,503

Applicant(s)

PI ET AL.

Examiner

Kianni C. Kaveh

Art Unit

2883

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 12 November 2003.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) 1-14 and 18-24 is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 15-17 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 12 November 2003 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☒ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date 5.
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____.
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: _____.

DETAILED ACTION

Restriction to one of the following inventions is required under 35 U.S.C. 121:

- I. Claims 1-5 and 21-24, drawn to a method including the steps of monitoring wavelength shift in a spectral peak in optical loss of light at the side surface, and extracting information about the external medium based on the wavelength shift, classified in class 385, subclass 30.
- II. Claims 6-20, drawn to a sensing device including a waveguide formed over the side surface and having a refractive index greater than an effective refractive index of the fiber, classified in class 385, subclass 12.

Inventions I and II are related as product and process of use. The inventions can be shown to be distinct if either or both of the following can be shown: (1) the process for using the product as claimed can be practiced with another materially different product or (2) the product as claimed can be used in a materially different process of using that product (MPEP § 806.05(h)). In the instant case the process of Group 1 invention can be practiced with an optical spectrum analyzer rather than as a sensing device, such as a hydrophone sensor for measurement of acoustic waves.

Because these inventions are distinct for the reasons given above and have acquired a separate status in the art as shown by their different classification, restriction for examination purposes as indicated is proper.

This application contains claims directed to the following patentably distinct species of the claimed invention: A) Group A invention, claims 6-11, directed to a

Art Unit: 2883

sensing device with a refractive index that is lower than that of a waveguide formed over the fiber; B) Group B invention, claims 12-14, directed to a fiber grating formed in the fiber at the location of the side surface to reflect light of a selected wavelength; Group C invention, claims 15-17 directed to a housing unit having a chamber to hold the fiber sensor and a movable diaphragm in the chamber; D) Group D invention, claims 18-20, directed to a substrate and a liquid layer on top of the overlay waveguide. Thus, each of the above group inventions A, B,C and D require a different search than that of other inventions.

Applicant is required under 35 U.S.C. 121 to elect a single disclosed species for prosecution on the merits to which the claims shall be restricted if no generic claim is finally held to be allowable. Currently, none of the claims are generic.

Applicant is advised that a reply to this requirement must include an identification of the species that is elected consonant with this requirement, and a listing of all claims readable thereon, including any claims subsequently added. An argument that a claim is allowable or that all claims are generic is considered nonresponsive unless accompanied by an election.

Upon the allowance of a generic claim, applicant will be entitled to consideration of claims to additional species which are written in dependent form or otherwise include all the limitations of an allowed generic claim as provided by 37 CFR 1.141. If claims are added after the election, applicant must indicate which are readable upon the elected species. MPEP § 809.02(a).

Art Unit: 2883

Should applicant traverse on the ground that the species are not patentably distinct, applicant should submit evidence or identify such evidence now of record showing the species to be obvious variants or clearly admit on the record that this is the case. In either instance, if the examiner finds one of the inventions unpatentable over the prior art, the evidence or admission may be used in a rejection under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) of the other invention.

During a telephone conversation with Mr. Ai on 6/2/05, as well as 6/6/05, a provisional election was made without traverse to prosecute the invention of Group C, claims 15-17. Affirmation of this election must be made by applicant in replying to this Office action. Claims 1-14, and 18-24 are withdrawn from further consideration by the examiner, 37 CFR 1.142(b), as being drawn to a non-elected invention.

Applicant is reminded that upon the cancellation of claims to a non-elected invention, the inventorship must be amended in compliance with 37 CFR 1.48(b) if one or more of the currently named inventors is no longer an inventor of at least one claim remaining in the application. Any amendment of inventorship must be accompanied by a request under 37 CFR 1.48(b) and by the fee required under 37 CFR 1.17(i).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC 112

Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

Art Unit: 2883

claim 7 is ambiguous, since 'coupled the fiber' is undefined as where/to-what the fiber is coupled. Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

- This application currently names joint inventors. In considering patentability of the claims under 35 U.S.C. 103(a), the examiner presumes that the subject matter of the various claims was commonly owned at the time any inventions covered therein were made absent any evidence to the contrary. Applicant is advised of the obligation under 37 CFR 1.56 to point out the inventor and invention dates of each claim that was not commonly owned at the time a later invention was made in order for the examiner to consider the applicability of 35 U.S.C. 103(c) and potential 35 U.S.C. 102(e), (f) or (g) prior art under 35 U.S.C. 103(a).

Claims 15-16 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over combination of Beasley (US 4360247) and Gerdt (US 5026984).

Regarding claim 15, Beasley teaches a sensing device (shown in at least fig. 2), comprising:

a fiber 32;

a fiber sensor in the fiber comprising a side surface on within a reach of an evanescent

Art Unit: 2883

fiber cladding of the fiber field of guided light in the fiber 34, and an overlay waveguide 32 on top of the side surface to extract light out of the side surface (see at least fig. 2, items 32 and 34, also see abstract, also col. 1, last parag.; wherein the fiber 34 senses pressure by change in evanescent optical light coupling);

a housing unit 12 having a chamber to hold the fiber sensor 32 and a movable diaphragm 28 in the chamber to transmit pressure to the fiber sensor in response to a pressure applied to the diaphragm (see at least fig. 2, items 32 and 34, also see abstract, also col. 1, last parag).

Beasley further teaches an optical detector to receive light in the fiber that transmits through the fiber sensor that detects the pressure on the diaphragm (see at least col. 1, lines 25-41; wherein the output pressure of the sensor is detected by a detector). However, Beasley does not specifically teach wherein a signal processor to process output of the optical detector and to determine the pressure on the diaphragm. This limitation more specifically taught by Gerdt (see at least col. 6, 4th parag.). Thus, Gerdt provides various specific configurations of the sensor for detecting external medium parameters (see col. 2, 6th parag.). Thus, it would have been obvious to a person of ordinary skill in the art when the invention was made to modify Beasley's optical sensing system by conventionally coupling its output pressure signal into a signal analyzer of Gerdt in order to produce an optical sensing device that includes the above limitations, since such sensing device would enable to compensate temperature factor in the sensor output (see col. 1, 3rd parag.).

Regarding claim 16, Beasley further teaches wherein the overlay waveguide is made of a glass (see col. 2, lines 32-34).

Citation of Relevant Prior Art

Prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure. In accordance with MPEP 707.05 the following references are pertinent in rejection of this application since they provide substantially the same information disclosure as this patent does. These references are:

Wlodarczk 4932263

Wlodarczk 4932262

Savit 4648082

Fulenwider et al. 4071753

These references are cited herein to show the relevance of the apparatus/methods taught within these references as prior art.

Contact Information

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to K. Cyrus Kianni whose telephone number is (571) 272-2417.

The examiner can normally be reached on Monday through Friday from 8:30 a.m. to 6:00 p.m. If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Frank Font, can be reached at (571) 272-2415.

Any response to this action should be mailed to:

Commissioner of Patents and Trademarks
Washington, D.C. 20231

or faxed to:

(703) 872-9306 (for formal communications intended for entry)

Art Unit: 2883

or:

Hand delivered responses should be brought to Crystal Plaza 4, 2021 South Clark Place, Arlington, VA., Fourth Floor (Receptionist).

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application should be directed to the Group Receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-0956.

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'K. Kianni', with a long horizontal flourish extending to the right.

K. Cyrus Kianni
Patent Examiner
Group Art Unit 2883

June 6, 2005